REMARKS

Claims 1-36 constitute the pending claims in the present application. No claims are cancelled or objected. Claims 6, 8, and 18-30 are withdrawn. Claims 1-5, 7, 9-17 and 31-36 stand rejected.

Telephonic Interview

Applicants note with appreciation the telephonic interview held with the Examiner and his supervisor on August 21, 2008. Briefly, Applicants' representatives pointed to Figure 1 of the present application as an illustrative example of an embodiment of the claimed invention that describes linking molecules having two inclusion guests that interact selectively and non-covalently to form inclusion complexes with inclusion hosts of the polymer to cross-link the polymer. Applicants' representatives explained that the Office Action did not specifically indicate how the cited art documents teach all of the elements of the claims. The Examiner and Applicants' representatives reviewed each of Yoshinaga, Agrawal et al., and Nobuhiko (U.S. Pat. Nos. 5,608,015; 5,691,316; and 5,855,900, respectively), and Applicants' representatives pointed out how each of the cited art documents fails to teach or suggest all the elements of the instant claims. The Examiner suggested that Applicants file a response to the Office Action and stated that he would reconsider the rejections upon receipt of the response.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner rejects claims 1-5, 7, 9-17 and 31-34 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Yoshinaga (U.S. Pat. No. 5,608,015; "Yoshinaga") in view of Agrawal et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,691,316; "Agrawal") and Nobuhiko (U.S. Pat. No. 5,855,900; "Nobuhiko").

Applicants submit that Yoshinaga fails to teach or suggest "a polymer composition comprising ... linking molecules, each linking molecule comprising at least two moieties that form inclusion complexes with the inclusion hosts, wherein the linking molecules crosslink the polymer through inclusion complexes" as recited in claims 1 and 15 and as analogously stated in claims 16-17.

Applicants note that while Agrawal describes polynucleotides covalently complexed with adamantane (see Agrawal abstract), this reference fails to teach or suggest a polymer composition comprising "a... polymer including a plurality of inclusion hosts, and linking molecules comprising at least two moieties that form inclusion complexes with the inclusion hosts, wherein the linking molecules crosslink the polymer through inclusion complexes" as recited in claims 1 and 15 and as analogously stated in claims 16-17.

Applicants point out that Nobuhiko describes biodegradable linear polymeric chains that are combined with cyclodextrin monomers by threading the polymeric chain through the cyclodextrin monomers, i.e., polyrotaxanes (see Figure 3). That is, the cyclodextrin monomers are separate and distinct entities from (i.e., not covalently attached to) the polymers. Thus, Nobuhiko fails to teach or suggest "a polymer composition comprising a ... polymer including a plurality of inclusion hosts..." as recited in claims 1 and 15 and as analogously stated in claims 16-17. This reference also fails to teach or suggest "linking molecules, each linking molecule comprising at least two moieties that form inclusion complexes with the inclusion hosts, wherein the linking molecules crosslink the polymer through inclusion complexes" as recited in claims 1 and 15 and as analogously stated in claims 16-17.

For reasons stated above, Yoshinaga, Agrawal and Nobuhiko, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the elements of instant claims 1 and 15-17 and those dependent thereon. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request removal of the rejection.

The Examiner rejects claims 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshinaga in view of Agrawal et al. and Nobuhiko and further in view of Platzek et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,068,831; "Platzek").

For the reasons stated above, Applicants submit that Yoshinaga, Agrawal and Nobuhiko, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the features of the pending claims. The Examiner states that Platzek teaches "pseudopolyrotaxanes, which are drawn to the current invention as disclosed." Furthermore, the Examiner claims that "polyrotaxane" is "the proper term for the compositions represented in the claimed invention." This is incorrect. Polyrotaxanes are compositions in which polymers are threaded through cyclic molecules, wherein the cyclic molecules are not covalently attached to the polymer; that is, the cyclic molecules are not part of the polymer. As explained above for Nobuhiko, the compositions of the claimed invention cannot be classified as polyrotaxanes, because the recited polymers of the pending claims include a plurality of inclusion hosts that are part of the polymer, i.e., that are covalently attached to the polymer. The polyrotaxanes of Platzek (and Nobuhiko) do not include such inclusion hosts. Thus, Platzek fails to teach or suggest "a linear biocompatible polymer including a plurality of inclusion hosts" in addition to the other features recited in claims 1 and 15-17.

Yoshinaga, Agrawal, Nobuhiko and Platzek, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the elements of instant claims 13 and 14. Applicants respectfully request removal of the rejection.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe no fee is due in connection with the filing of this response. However, if an additional fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-1945, under Order No. ITI-P01-010 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: September 5, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By________________
Carl A. Morales, Ph.D.
Registration No.: 57,415
ROPES & GRAY LLP
One International Place
Boston, Massachusetts 02110
(617) 951-7000
(617) 951-7050 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant